Passport Bill Blocked? P. 3

Behind the Scenes at Baghdad: Was it Chamoun Who Sealed Nuri's Fate? Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 29 JULY 28, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Krushchev Breaks Out of Containment

We landed the Marines in Lebanon, and (as this is being written early on the morning of July 24) it looks as if Nikita Krushchev in turn is about to land in New York. This would seem to be an authentic case of Divine Retribution, but has badly shaken the faith of Washington's foremost Presbyterian. The news that Krushchev was coming burst on this capital yesterday in a way which showed that the Russians simply cannot be trusted. All day and into the late afternoon editions, banner headlines based on a sour editorial in *Izvestia* blared comfortingly that Krushchev was about to spurn Ike's queasy invitation to a conference at the UN. At 3:20 p. m. the UPI ticker even carried a statement from the usually silent Soviet embassy, saying that "well qualified Russian sources" in Washington had predicted that the Kremlin would reject the Western offer "as a complete evasion." At 3:21 p. m., one minute later, there was a flash from Moscow that the Soviet Foreign Office would soon issue an important announcement. At 4:04 p. m. the ticker spelled out that Krushchev had accepted. Had a sputnik fallen on the White House putting green, it could not have created more panic.

From Crisis to Comedy

This has been a swift period of anti-climax, collapsing suddenly into low comedy. Last Monday a week, after the Iraq revolt, the President met Congressional leaders at the White House with the exalted calm of a man who was ready for Armageddon. But our Marines had hardly embarked in Beirut on what seemed to be a major departure of policy well past the point of no return than the Administration began nervously semaphoring that it wanted out. Suddenly we became a fervent member of the UN again and after several days it appeared that we would accept observer teams in Lebanon armed only with paper and pencil if Mr. Hammarskjold would get us off the hook, and allow us gracefully to get the Marines away from all those soda pop vendors on the Beirut beaches. While Mr. Lodge, desperate for repartee, accused Mr. Sobelov and the Soviet Union of violating the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, the hectic week-end at the UN was marked by wistful efforts to water down the Japanese resolution to the point where Moscow might vote for it and allow an enlarged UN observer team to save face for the withdrawing Marines. And now the summit conference Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower have tried so hard to avoid for two years seems suddenly upon them; the ebullient Krushchev might drop in at any moment. How the White House wishes there were still some last-minute way to stop him, perhaps by refusing him a visa for having been a member of the Ukrainian YCL in 1921, or by getting the bacteriological warfare corps to infect the White House with mumps. Across the dismal confusion at Hagerty's office last night was scrawled all too plainly, even before the visitor arrived, *Krushchev go home.*

Revenge for Suez?

Perfidious Albion had led Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles into a trap, revenging itself for the Suez affair. The British had assured them that they could safely suggest a UN meeting in reply to Krushchev's new call for a summit conference. Hadn't the Russians over and over again complained of a "mechanical majority" against them at the UN? Would Krushchev ever consent to sit down with Chiang Kai-shek? Even so the draft of our reply, as communicated last Sunday night to favored correspondents, was pure cold war diatribe suggesting only that "it lies open to any of us to enlarge the scope of the Security Council considerations." It was Macmillan who widened this microscopic loophole to the point where the bulky Krushchev came climbing through. First, under pressure from London, the U. S. added the two fatal sentences about Heads of Government being allowed to attend Council meetings and our being ready "If such a meeting were generally desired" to "join in following that orderly procedure." Then Macmillan translated these nebulous phrases into his own message to Krushchev, "I would certainly be ready to go to New York for such a meeting . . . and I take it . . . that you would." And Krushchev, before you could say Jack Dmitrievich Robinson, did.

"Everybody Loves A Fat Man"

Now the nightmare that haunts Washington is what happens when Ike finishes his prepared text and has to think up a swiftie under the TV cameras for one of those *moujik* anecdotes Krushchev always seems to have up his sleeve. If there must be a face-to-face encounter, Washington would rather have it in some far-off place like, say, Khabarovsk, where the networks can't operate. Of course, in a diplomatic sense, as de Gaulle objected, nothing can possibly happen at a summit conference amid the crowds on the East River. But in another, public relations sense, much will if the meeting comes off. For the Russians have us over a barrel in the Middle East, and in Krushchev they have a star performer, a shrewd comic, a natural born vaudevillian, eager to appear at last on Broadway, where he will be the biggest hit of its kind since Fatty Arbuckle played the Palace. Mr. Dulles's cold war will never be the same again once Nikita hits town.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Planning Association Report Reveals Our "Counter-Force" Strategy

Test Cessation Advocated to End Nuclear "Sky's The Limit" Poker Game

If the world gets safely past the current crisis, an agreement to end nuclear testing will be urgent. In another decade, if half a dozen other nations have nuclear weapons, peace will be even more precarious. Imagine a world in which Greece and Turkey could use nuclear weapons over Cyprus, or one in which Nasser and Ben Gurion could exchange nuclear blows in an atomic Sarajevo. The shape of things to come is clearly foreshadowed by the news that France, Switzerland and Sweden are all pressing forward to nuclear arms. It will soon be too late if the thermonuclear powers do not follow up the talks at Geneva with an agreement to end testing, yet these talks though welcome are in part a sham. The real issues are political, not technical, and the U. S. military is opposed to cessation of testing.

Some of the reasons for this opposition are sketched out in the thoughtful report just released by a special committee of the National Planning Association which includes such men as Col. Richard S. Leghorn, Prof. Harrison Brown, David Riesman and Norman Cousins. Nuclear study groups should obtain copies (1606 New Hampshire Ave., N. W., Wash. 9, D. C.). It appears from this that U. S. military policy is based not just on the deterrent retaliatory power to wipe out Russia's key industrial centers but on a "counter force" strategy which requires us to build enough planes and missiles to destroy Russia's striking forces "and then some." Naturally this sets in motion a nuclear poker game, in which each side must outbid the other, with the sky the limit.

The NPA report says, "The counter-force strategy is now the doctrinal source of the arms race, demanding big bombs to make up for bombing errors and to kill with certainty small and elusive targets. It also demands smaller packaging to permit more accurate and swift delivery systems. It requires virtually indefinite testing." The report concludes from Russian willingness to end tests that the USSR "is trying to build an intercontinental retaliatory sufficiency and not a counter-force nuclear superiority," otherwise it would be "hard to understand how she could possibly consent to be frozen in a position of inferiority in bomb know-how, or how she could so readily give up testing of smaller and smaller packages."

The NPA therefore recommends breaking up the U. S. arms package, a separate agreement to end testing under an international monitoring system, and cessation of U. S. tests after the current series for two years while such a system can be established. Since the only detection problem is with very small tests underground, the NPA advocates agreement for international control "of only those explosions which the inspection grid can reliably detect." It bases its plea for cessation of testing primarily on security rather than health considerations and believes that the U. S. has more to gain than lose by ending tests.

Victory Against Blacklisting

For the first time since Attorney General Francis Biddle began compiling it in the early 40's, a group of organizations has succeeded in getting the government to drop them from the so-called Attorney General's list. Suit was brought by the Workers Party, its successor, the Independent Socialist League, and its affiliate, the Socialist Youth League. The Workers Defense League took up the case in 1948. Formal delisting hearings began three years ago before a Justice Department hearing officer, who ruled that they should continue to be blacklisted. Their attorney, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., then appealed to Attorney General Rogers. The latter, according to a letter written Mr. Rauh by J. Walter Yeagley, Acting Assistant Attorney General for Internal Security, was "not satisfied with the evidence adduced at the hearings meets the strict standards of proof which should guide the determination of proceedings of this character." He felt it was "impracticable," however, to reopen the hearings because some witnesses had died. The organizations, therefore, are to be dropped from the list. The victory won by this Marxist splinter group led by Max Schactman should encourage others to fight the list.

Fifth Amendment Ruling: "Hiss Act" Declared Unconstitutional

An important Fifth amendment decision has just been handed down in the U. S. Court of Claims. It has held unconstitutional the so-called "Hiss Act" by which Congress directed non-payment of retirement pensions to any former government employe who invoked the Fifth amendment in any inquiry into his service with the government. The law was supposedly aimed at Alger Hiss, though he never took the Fifth. The test suit before the Court of Claims was brought by a former Internal Revenue Service employe who pleaded the Fifth in a grand jury inquiry and was later indicted but found not guilty. He sued for his annuity.

The Court split on the question of whether this constituted a gratuity or a contractual obligation, the majority taking the former view. All but one judge substantially agreed that the Act was unconstitutional "because Congress has linked the innocent with the guilty in exacting a form of punishment" for invoking a basic right. The one dissenter cited the recent *Beilan* and *Lerner* decisions by the Supreme Court which held that a public employe might be discharged for using the privilege against self-incrimination. He argued that these rulings indicated that public employes might be deprived of pensions as well as their jobs.

Soustelle's Appointment to de Gaulle Cabinet Bad News for France

Both Claude Bourdet in *France-Observateur* for July 10 and Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber in *L'Express* of the same date report that Jacques Soustelle's appointment as Minister of Information in de Gaulle's Cabinet violated a pledge given center and left politicians. Both weeklies declare de Gaulle promised that M. Soustelle would be kept out of the government.

M. Soustelle, a gifted writer and ethnologist, was like M. Malraux a man of the Left in the 30's, rallied to de Gaulle during the resistance, emerged from the war an authoritarian de Gaullist, was won over by the *colons* after his appointment as Governor of Algeria by Mendes-France, and became a leading figure in the recent Algerian conspiracy. His account of his Governorship, *Aimée et Souffrante Algérie*, shows his bitter animosity toward the press over which his new post gives him wide power.

Though de Gaulle began by abolishing the censorship, the Soustelle appointment and certain high-handed actions by the military bode ill for the press. An issue each of *L'Express* and *France-Observateur* were subjected to seizure and censorship by the Army, and an issue of *Le Monde* was barred from Algiers. Significantly the Army seems very sensitive to interviews with rebel leaders which suggest that peaceful negotiation is still possible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Murphy Discovers Magna Charta (in A Sunday Supplement) But Misreads It

State Dept. Covertly Reimposes Passport Screening Despite Court Ruling

There were three noteworthy developments in the field of passport legislation during the past week. The first was sudden postponement of hearings on the pending Administration bill July 17 as a result of action by Senator Morse, who invoked Senate rules to prevent the Foreign Relations Committee from holding hearings while the Senate is in session; the effect was sharply to lessen the chances that any legislation will be passed this session. The second was reimposition by the State Department of loyalty screening on passport applicants who do not sign the non-Communist affidavit; this action, in defiance of the Supreme Court decision, seems to have been imposed by orders from above on the passport division, which had been clearing all applications without discrimination in compliance with the Court's ruling in *Kent* and *Briehl*. We suggest that any persons who run into difficulties because of this illegal screening procedure write to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with copies of their letter for Senator Morse, who (as can be seen from the box below) is on the warpath. The third development was the news that the American Civil Liberties Union has reversed its earlier position (criticized at the time in the *Weekly*) that the Secretary of State should be allowed to deny a passport where he had substantial evidence that the applicant was going abroad to engage in "real subversive activity." When the hearings resume, the ACLU will support the principles embodied in the bill (S4137) sponsored by Senators Humphrey, Morse and five other Senators, fully establishing the right to travel in peacetime.

Slight Difference

The one day hearing July 16 heard Deputy Under Secretary of State Robert D. Murphy and a covey of aides from the State Department. Mr. Murphy said his attention had been drawn by a Sunday story in the *Washington Post* to the fact that the right to travel was embodied in Magna Charta. "Now in thinking over this provision of the Magna Charta," he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "I find nothing in the legislation which the Administration has proposed on this subject in contradiction to the principles stated in the Magna Charta." The only difference, as sharp questioning by Senators Morse, Humphrey, Fulbright and Sparkman soon brought out, is that while Magna Charta made travel a right even the King could not suspend, the Administration bill S4110 makes it a privilege dependent on the Secretary of State. Write your Senators to back S4137 and oppose S4110, lest the Administration's McCarthy era legislation slip through somehow in the closing days of the session. The fact that Javits of New York, who plays close to the White House, has come out against the Administration bill, though favoring some travel control, reflects the strength of the pressure building up.

A Correction from Sen. Humphrey

Dear Mr. Stone:

I have read with interest the remarks that appeared in the June 30 issue of your Weekly regarding the bill for furnishing atomic information and materials to other nations.

Your Weekly has such a fine reputation for accuracy that I know you would not want any of your comments to leave your readers with a misleading impression. Your reference to me in the newsletter might leave such an impression.

I was not in the Senate when the bill (S 3912) was brought up and passed because I had been given firm assurance that the Senate would not consider this measure until the following day. I had every intention of participating in the debate on the bill. Furthermore, I had prepared a rather lengthy statement which I planned to deliver when the bill was before the Senate and which I did make on June 25, two days later.

If you will read that statement you will note I had two serious reservations about the bill which Senator Anderson's amendments and the Senate debate helped to remove.

You have every right to disagree with my position on this legislation, but I believe as an able journalist you have a responsibility to report my position accurately to your readers.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

As we noted at the time, Majority Leader Johnson had assured the Senate that there would be no roll-call on S3912 Monday, June 23. No one dreamt that this could mean he might try to push the bill through without a roll-call. Senator Humphrey's letter now indicates that he was specifically told there would be no vote. We learn that a serious illness in his family kept him out of town on the 23rd. Unfortunately we did not know this at the time our issue of the 30th was written; his speech of the 25th came too late for that issue, and indeed escaped our attention. Senator Humphrey's able address of the 25th shows how fully aware he was of the crucial issues in this bill and of the need for safeguarding amendments. We regret an unintentional injustice to a most conscientious and progressive Senator.—IFS.

How Morse Delayed the Passport Hearings and May Have Blocked The Bill

Mr. MORSE. There is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the administration passport bill. The chief architects, so far as I can ascertain, are Mr. Dulles and Mr. Murphy. I would describe their architectural work as an illegal, unconstitutional house of legislative ill-fame, because it is such a serious attack upon the basic liberties of the American people and it is, in my judgment, so in violation of the elemental principles of due process of law. Under this bill the courts would not have available to them the unrecorded, secret evidence the Secretary of State would use in denying a passport. How could such a shocking proposal be made to the Congress of the United States by a President of the United States?

I consider this such a challenge to American civil rights and the constitutional guaranties of a free people that I propose to be in attendance at the committee hearings when this bill is under consideration. Therefore, I now notify the Senate that I file a standing objection to any hearing being conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on passport legislation while the Senate is in session. . . .

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Oregon whether his objection applies only to passport hearings.

Mr. MORSE. Only to the passport hearings, because I intend to follow those hearings minute by minute and hour by hour, and I have a great many questions to ask the administration witnesses in regard to their bill.

Never, during my 13 years of service in the Senate, have I been so deeply moved by what I consider to be an inexcusable attack on constitutional guaranties as are to be found in the administration's proposed passport bill.

—U. S. Senate, July 16.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Question Senate Foreign Relations Might Put to CIA In Its Coming Inquiry

Did the Iraqi Army Revolt Against Intervention in Lebanon?

There is reason to suspect that the Iraqi revolt, though long in preparation, was triggered by the Army's belief that it might be ordered to intervene in the Lebanon on behalf of President Chamoun. This aspect of the uprising was hastily brushed under the rug by those who brief the press in Washington but may be found in leading British and French papers.

The day before the Iraqi revolt the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent in Beirut reported that the chances of a compromise settlement were brighter under pressure from Lebanese business interests sick of the fighting. But he added that Chamoun's supporters "continue to fight a delaying action on the international front" and looked for "a rescue operation" from the meeting scheduled to open in Istanbul next day (July 14) by the heads of state of the Moslem members of the Baghdad Pact.

"Messages from Istanbul and Baghdad stating that Turkey and Iraq in particular were ready to provide military help to protect 'Lebanese independence'," the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent continued (under dateline of July 13 in the issue of the 14th), "have been given prominence in the Loyalist press in Beirut, and a spokesman for the Lebanese government echoed this yesterday when he said that such help had been offered."

Nuri Knew There Might Be Trouble

The London *Sunday Times* of July 13 also carried a dispatch from its knowledgeable correspondent H. A. R. Philby saying that the Lebanese government, disappointed in the West, was looking to Turkey and Iraq for help. The London *Times* two days later in its "leader" on the coup d'etat in Baghdad said it could be "that rumours of possible intervention by the Iraq Army in Lebanon brought matters to a head."

This aspect of the revolt was also touched upon by the Middle Eastern expert of *Le Monde* in Paris. Edouard Sablier, just back from the Lebanon, wrote a lengthy background report in the issue of July 17. In it he said that for several years ultra-nationalist propaganda had affected the Army, that there were reports of massive purges and executions within its ranks, and that the Prime Minister, Nuri es Said, was worried about its mounting hostility.

Then M. Sablier added, "When the Baghdad pact powers considered the sending of troops into Lebanon to check the insurrection, the old statesman (Nuri) did not hide the fact that he could no longer depend on absolute loyalty from his Army." The Army struck at 5 a. m. on July 14, the day the King was to meet in Istanbul with the other Baghdad Pact powers and to take up the Lebanese question. Nuri himself, as he showed in a press conference two weeks earlier in London (see the London *Times* of June 27) was in favor of intervention and of Iraqi participation.

As Seen Through Nationalist Eyes

Such intervention, from a nationalist point of view, meant acting in concert with the two ancient enemies of Iraq, the Turks and the British, both former occupying powers, to invade another Arab country against fellow Arab nationalists.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted on July 22 to question officials of the Central Intelligence Agency as to why the Iraqi revolt caught this country so by surprise. We had a U. S. military mission in the country to supervise the use of the $45,000,000 in military equipment we gave Iraq. We were thus in good position to know what was going on in the Iraqi armed forces. How could we have remained so ignorant of the danger? If CIA can be that unaware in a friendly country, where we have a military mission, how dependable is its intelligence elsewhere?

An ironic footnote to the whole affair is provided by the well-informed Middle Eastern expert, Jon Kimche, who pointed out in the London *Express* of July 15 that the "dossiers of the Baghdad Pact anti-subversion committee, which were in the headquarters building in Baghdad, are now open for inspection by curious and interested parties." The U. S. was a member of the anti subversion committee. In the light of the record, perhaps the rebels had better not take those intelligence files too seriously.

Why Not Give Your Pastor or Rabbi A Subscription to the Weekly?

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

7/28/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED